## Math 421, Homework #9 Solutions

(1) (a) A set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be *path connected* if for any pair of points  $\mathbf{x} \in E$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in E$  there exists a continuous function  $\gamma: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying  $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{x}, \gamma(1) = \mathbf{y}$ , and  $\gamma(t) \in E$  for all  $t \in [0,1]$ . Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and assume that E is path connected. Prove that E is connected.

*Proof.* We will argue by contradiction. Assume that E is not connected. Then there exists sets  $U \subset E$  and  $V \subset E$  which are nonempty, disjoint  $(U \cap V = \emptyset)$ , relatively open in E, and  $U \cup V = E.$ 

Consider points  $\mathbf{x} \in U$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in V$  (which we can do because we assume that U and V are both nonempty). Since E is path connected, we can find a continuous map  $\gamma: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying  $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{x}, \gamma(1) = \mathbf{y}, \text{ and } \gamma([0,1]) \subset E.$  Define sets  $U' = U \cap \gamma([0,1])$  and  $V' = V \cap \gamma([0,1])$ . We claim that U' and V' separate  $\gamma([0,1])$ . Indeed, since  $\mathbf{x} \in U$  and  $\mathbf{x} = \gamma(0) \in \gamma([0,1])$  we have that  $\mathbf{x} \in U' = U \cap \boldsymbol{\gamma}([0,1])$  so U' is nonempty. Similarly  $\mathbf{y} \in V' = V \cap \boldsymbol{\gamma}([0,1])$  so V' is nonempty. Since  $U \cap V = \emptyset$  we have that

 $U' \cap V' = (U \cap \gamma([0,1])) \cap (V \cap \gamma([0,1])) = U \cap V \cap \gamma([0,1]) = \emptyset,$ 

and similarly, since  $\gamma([0,1]) \subset E$  by assumption we have that

$$U' \cup V' = (U \cap \gamma([0,1])) \cup (V \cap \gamma([0,1]))$$
$$= (U \cup V) \cap \gamma([0,1])$$
$$= E \cap \gamma([0,1]) = \gamma([0,1]).$$

Finally, we observe that the Lemma stated in the solutions to Homework #5 implies that U' and V' are relatively open in  $\gamma([0,1])$ . We conclude that  $\gamma([0,1])$  is not connected.

However, since [0,1] is connected, and  $\gamma$  is continuous, it follows from Theorem 9.30 that  $\gamma([0,1])$  is connected. This contradiction shows that E must be connected as well.  $\square$ 

(b) Prove that open balls in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are connected, i.e. given  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and r > 0 prove that  $B_r(\mathbf{a})$  is connected.

*Proof.* Applying part (a) it suffices to show that an open ball is always path connected. Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , let r > 0, and let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B_r(\mathbf{a})$ .

Define  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}: [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) = (1-t)\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{y}.$$

Then  $\gamma$  is a continuous function since each component function is a first-order polynomial in t. Moreover  $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{x}$  and  $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{y}$ . We claim that  $\gamma(t) \in B_r(\mathbf{a})$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Indeed for t = 0or t = 1 we have that  $\gamma(t) \in B_r(\mathbf{a})$  by assumption. Moreover, for  $t \in (0, 1)$  we have that

$\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) - \mathbf{a}\  = \ (1-t)\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{a}\ $	
$= \ (1-t)(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{a}) + t(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{a})\ $	$\mathbf{a} = (1-t)\mathbf{a} + t\mathbf{a}$
$\leq \ (1-t)(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{a})\  + \ t(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{a})\ $	triangle inequality
$= \left 1-t\right  \left\ \mathbf{x}-\mathbf{a}\right\  + \left t\right  \left\ \mathbf{y}-\mathbf{a}\right\ $	properties of norms
$<\left 1-t\right r+\left t\right r$	$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in B_r(\mathbf{a}), t \neq 0 \text{ and } t \neq 1$
= (1-t)r + tr = r	since $t \in (0, 1)$ .

We conclude that  $\gamma(t) \in B_r(\mathbf{a})$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore  $B_r(\mathbf{a})$  is path-connected, and by part (a),  $B_r(\mathbf{a})$  is connected.  (c) Prove that  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is connected.

*Proof.* Arguing as in part (b), given  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the function  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$  defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) = (1-t)\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{y}$$

is a continuous function with  $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{x}$ ,  $\gamma(1) = \mathbf{y}$  and  $\gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Therefore  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is path connected, and hence connected by part (a).

Alternate proof. We have that

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} B_k(\mathbf{0})$$

and that

$$\bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}}B_k(\mathbf{0})=B_1(\mathbf{0})\neq\emptyset.$$

Therefore problem 2(b) from Homework #5 tells us that  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is connected since each of the sets  $B_k(\mathbf{0})$  is connected.

(d) Prove that only subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  which are both open and closed are  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is open and closed, and that  $U \neq \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $U \neq \emptyset$ . We claim that U and  $V := U^c$  separate  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Indeed U is open (and hence relatively open in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) and nonempty by assumption. Since U is also assumed to be closed,  $V = U^c$  is also open. Moreover, since we assume that  $U \neq \mathbb{R}^n$  it must by that  $V = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus U$  is nonempty. Finally we have that

and that

$$U \cup V = U \cup U^c = \mathbb{R}^n.$$

 $U \cap V = U \cap U^c = \emptyset$ 

Therefore U and V separate  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and therefore  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is not connected in contradiction part to (c). This contradiction lets us conclude that any subset U of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that is both open and closed must satisfy either  $U = \mathbb{R}^n$  or  $U = \emptyset$ . (2) Consider a function  $\mathbf{f} : E \subset \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$  and assume that  $\mathbf{f}$  is continuous at some point  $\mathbf{a} \in E$  and that  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Prove that there is an r > 0 so that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in E$  with  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\| < r$ ,  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \neq \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  is assumed to be continuous at  $\mathbf{a}$  we can find an r > 0 so that

$$\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})\| < \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})\| (\neq 0) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in E \text{ with } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\| < r.$$

Using the triangle inequality, it follows that for  $\mathbf{x} \in E$  with  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\| < r$ 

$$\|\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\| - \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})\|\| \le \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})\| < \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})\|$$

or equivalently that

$$-rac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \| < \| \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \| - \| \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \| < rac{1}{2} \| \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) \|$$

and hence

$$\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\| > \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a})\| \neq 0 \quad \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in E \text{ with } \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\| < r.$$

Therefore  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \neq \mathbf{0}$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in E$  with  $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\| < r$ .

Alternate proof. Assume not. Then for every r > 0 there is an  $\mathbf{x}_r \in E$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{x}_r - \mathbf{a}\| < r$  and  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_r) = \mathbf{0}$ . In particular, for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there is an  $\mathbf{x}_k \in E$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{a}\| < \frac{1}{k}$  and  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \mathbf{0}$ . But then we can use the squeeze theorem with  $\|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{a}\| < \frac{1}{k}$  to conclude that  $\mathbf{x}_k \to \mathbf{a}$  so  $\mathbf{x}_k$  is a sequence in E converging to  $\mathbf{a}$ . Consequently, the sequential characterization of continuity and the assumption that  $\mathbf{f}$  is continuous at  $\mathbf{a}$  let's us conclude that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}).$$

However, since  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , this leads to the contradiction

$$\mathbf{0} \neq \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_k) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{0} = \mathbf{0}$$

This contradiction allows us to conclude the original statement is true.

(3) Let  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  and  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$  be open intervals and let  $(a, b) \in I \times J$ . Given a function  $f : I \times J \to \mathbb{R}$  define functions  $g : I \to \mathbb{R}$  and  $h : J \to \mathbb{R}$  by

$$g(x) = f(x, b)$$
 and  $h(x) = f(a, x)$ .

(a) Assume that f is continuous at (a, b). Prove that g is continuous at a and that h is continuous at b.

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  Since f is assumed to be continuous at (a, b), there exists a  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$|f(x,y) - f(a,b)| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } (x,y) \in I \times J \text{ with } ||(x,y) - (a,b)|| < \delta.$$

Then if  $x \in I$  and  $|x - a| < \delta$ , we have  $||(x, b) - (a, b)|| = \sqrt{(x - a)^2} = |x - a| < \delta$  so we can use the definition of g to conclude that

$$g(x) - g(a)| = |f(x,b) - f(a,b)| < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore g is continuous at a. Similarly, we have that if  $y \in J$  and  $|y-b| < \delta$ , then  $||(a,y) - (a,b)|| = |y-b| < \delta$  so

$$|h(y) - h(b)| = |f(a, y) - f(a, b)| < \varepsilon,$$

and hence h is continuous at b.

(b) Show that the converse of part (a) is not true, i.e. find an example of a function  $f: I \times J \to \mathbb{R}$  which is not continuous at (a, b) but where g is continuous at a and h is continuous at b (with g and h defined as above).

*Example.* Let  $f: (-1,1) \times (-1,1) \to \mathbb{R}$  be defined by

$$f(x,y) = \begin{cases} 0 & xy = 0\\ 1 & xy \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

and let (a, b) = (0, 0). Then it's easy to show that f is not continuous at (0, 0) (for example we could use the sequential characterization of limits with  $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(\frac{1}{k}, \frac{1}{k}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} 1 = 1$  and  $\lim_{k\to\infty} f(\frac{1}{k}, 0) = \lim_{k\to\infty} 0 = 0$ ). However,

$$q(x) = f(x,0) = 0$$

for all  $x \in (-1, 1)$  so g is continuous on (-1, 1) since g is constant. Similarly

$$h(y) = f(0, y) = 0$$

for all  $y \in (-1, 1)$  so h is continuous on (-1, 1) since h is constant.

(4) Find an example of a continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$  and a closed set  $F \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  so that f(F) not a closed set.

*Example.* Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be defined by  $f(x) = \frac{x}{\sqrt{1+x^2}}$  A straightforward computation shows that the function  $g: (-1, 1) \to \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $g(x) = \frac{x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}$  satisfies

f(g(x)) = x for all  $x \in (-1, 1)$ 

and

g(f(x)) = x for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

f is invertible and  $f^{-1} = g$ . We can conclude from this that  $f(\mathbb{R}) = (-1, 1)$ . Then the image of the closed set  $\mathbb{R}$  is (-1, 1) which is not closed.

**Remark.** Note that in constructing your example, the closed set F must be unbounded. This is because if F were both closed and bounded, the Heine-Borel Theorem would tell us that F is compact, and then f(F) would be compact, and hence closed and bounded, by Theorem 9.29. Therefore if we are to have f(F) not closed with f continuous and F closed, it must be the case that F is not bounded.